

## REMARKS

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 11 and 14 as lacking antecedent basis for various elements. Claim 11 has been canceled and Claim 14 has been amended to correct the lack of antecedent basis due to incorrectly stated dependency. Therefore, Applicants believe the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are overcome.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 9 as being anticipated by Shaffer, et al. (U.S. 6,237,364). Claims 1 and 9 have been canceled. Therefore Applicants believe that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) have been overcome.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 11 as being unpatentable over Shaffer. Claim 11 has been canceled. Therefore Applicants believe that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of Claims 19-22 over the prior art.

The Examiner indicates in the above-referenced Office Action, that Claims 2-8 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any independent claims. The Applicants have so amended, and therefore believe that Claims 2-8 and 10 should be allowed.

The Examiner also indicates that Claims 12-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections under 35 U.S.C. §112 with respect to Claims 11 and 14 and further rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any independent claims. The Applicants have so amended, and therefore believe that Claims 12-18 should be allowed.

Therefore, Applicants believe that all rejections and objections have been overcome.


### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' claimed invention is deserving of patent protection because it describes a useful and functioning structure, which is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that this Response, in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that they have persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 2-8, 10 and 12-22 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

It is not believed that this Amendment letter requires any fee other than the fee of \$2400 for 12 additional independent claims for which a check is attached, but if there are any other fees incurred by this Response Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account NO. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Andrew M. Harris  
Reg. No. 42,638  
(706)-782-9683

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.  
4204 North Brown Ave.  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251